UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,874	01/16/2002	Bryan D. Zerhusen	21402-245 (Cura 545)	7951

7590 11/10/2003

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

EXAMINER	
LANDSMAN, ROBERT S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1647	

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/051,874	PADIGARU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Landsman	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 September 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *42-64* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *42-64* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority und r 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4/30/02 10/7/03
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: Sequence Comparison

DETAILED ACTION

1. Formal Matters

A. Claims 1-41 were pending and were subject to restriction mailed 6/4/03. Applicants elected Group II without traverse. However, Applicants canceled claims 1-41 and submitted new claims 42-64, drawn to the same subject matter as Group II. Therefore, claims 42-64 are pending and are the subject of this Office Action.

B. The Information Disclosure Statement, filed 4/30/02, has been entered into the record.

C. The Information Disclosure Statement, filed 10/07/03, has been entered into the record.

2. Information Disclosure Statement

A. Reference C4 on the IDS filed 4/30/02 has been lined through since it has no publication date.

B. References C217-243 on the IDS filed 4/30/02 have been lined through since they have no submission date.

C. Reference C274 of the IDS filed 10/7/03 has been lined through since an International Search Report is not proper subject matter for an IDS. The references of the Report should be listed separately.

3. Drawing

A. No drawings could be found in this application. If this is incorrect, please inform the Examiner of the submission date of any drawings as well as which pages of the specification the Brief Description can be found.

4. Priority Claim

A. The specification is objected to since the priority claim is incomplete since no application number appears for the filing date of 11/9/01. Furthermore, attorney docket numbers should be removed from the specification, including from the priority claim. Finally, Applicants will only receive priority to the filing date of the present application unless Applicants can point out to which of the large number of provisional applications Applicants deserve priority.

5. Specification

A. Claims 55 and 56 are objected to since the claim should recite "the vector of claim."

6. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

A. Claims 42-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial and credible asserted utility or a well established utility. These claims are directed to polynucleotides encoding the protein of SEQ ID NO:18 as well as methods of making the protein. However, the invention encompassed by these claims has no apparent or disclosed patentable utility. This rejection is consistent with the current utility guidelines, published 1/5/01, 66 FR 1092. The instant application has provided a description of an isolated protein. However, the instant application does not disclose a specific and substantial biological role of this protein or its significance.

However, it is clear from the instant specification that the claimed receptor is what is termed an "orphan receptor" in the art. The instant application does not disclose the biological role of the claimed protein or its significance. Applicants disclose in the specification that the claimed receptor is homologous to B7-H2 (chart on page 7 and laundry list on page 9 of the specification). However, this is not predictive of a use. There is little doubt that, after complete characterization, this protein will probably be found to have a patentable utility. This further characterization, however, is part of the act of invention and, until it has been undertaken, Applicants' claimed invention is incomplete.

The instant situation is directly analogous to that of which was addressed in Brenner v. Manson, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (Sus. Ct, 1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anticancer activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an antitumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are "useful" to the chemical arts when this term is given its broadest interpretation. However, the court held that this broad interpretation was not the intended definition of "useful" as it appears in 35 U.S.C. 101, which required that an invention must have either an immediate obvious or fully disclosed "real-world" utility. The court held that:

> "The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility," "[u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point - where specific benefit exists in currently available form – there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field," and "a patent is not a hunting license," "[i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion."

The specification discloses that the polynucleotides of the invention encode proteins which have significant sequence similarity to B7-H2. Based on the structural similarity, the specification asserts that the newly disclosed SEQ ID NO:17 and 18 have similar activities. The assertion that the disclosed proteins have biological activities similar to B7-H2 cannot be accepted in the absence of supporting evidence, because generally, the art acknowledges that function cannot be predicted based solely on structural similarity to a protein found in the sequence databases.

For example, Skolnick et al. (2000, Trends in Biotech. 18:34-39) state that knowing the protein structure by itself is insufficient to annotate a number of functional classes, and is also insufficient for annotating the specific details of protein function (see Box 2, p. 36). Similarly, Bork (2000, Genome Research 10:398-400) states that the error rate of functional annotations in the sequence database is considerable, making it even more difficult to infer correct function from a structural comparison of a new sequence with a sequence database (see especially p. 399). Such concerns are also echoed by Doerks et al. (1998, Trends in Genetics 14:248-250) who state that (1) functional information is only partially annotated in the database, ignoring multi functionality, resulting in underpredictions of functionality of a new protein and (2) overpredictions of functionality occur because structural similarity often does not necessarily coincide with functional similarity. Smith et al. (1997, Nature Biotechnology 15:1222-1223) remark that there are numerous cases in which proteins having very different functions share structural similarity due to evolution from a common ancestral gene.

Brenner (1999, Trends in Genetics 15:132-133) argues that accurate inference of function from homology must be a difficult problem since, assuming there are only about 1000 major gene superfamilies in nature, then most homologs must have different molecular and cellular functions. Finally, Bork et al. (1996, Trends in Genetics 12:425-427) add that the software robots that assign functions to new proteins often assign a function to a whole new protein based on structural similarity of a small domain of the new protein to a small domain of a known protein. Such questionable interpretations are written into the sequence database and are then considered facts.

Therefore, based on the discussions above concerning the specific examples of structurally similar proteins that have different functions, along with the art's recognition that one cannot rely upon structural similarity alone to determine functionality, the specification fails to teach the skilled artisan the utility of the claimed polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO:18 which are only known to be homologous to B7-H2. Therefore, the instant claims are drawn to a polynucleotide encoding a protein which has a yet undetermined function or biological significance. There is no actual and specific significance which can be attributed to said protein identified in the specification. For this reason, the instant invention is

incomplete. In the absence of a knowledge of the natural ligands or biological significance of this protein, there is no immediately obvious patentable use for it. To employ a protein of the instant invention in the identification of substances which bind to and/or mediate activity of the said receptor is clearly to use it as the object of further research which has been determined by the courts to be a non-patentable utility. Since the instant specification does not disclose a "real-world" use for said protein then the claimed invention is incomplete and, therefore, does not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 as being useful.

Furthermore, since the nucleic acids of the invention are not supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility, the vector, host cell, polypeptide and method for producing the claimed polypeptide also lack utility.

7. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph - enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

A. Claims 42-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to use the instant invention. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial and credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

B. Furthermore, even if the claims possessed utility, claims 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 56, 58, 60 and 62 would still be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for SEQ ID NO:17 and 18 with the SNPs disclosed on page 7, does not reasonably provide enablement for other SNPs. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In In re Wands, 8USPQ2d, 1400 (CAFC 1988) page 1404, the factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

First, the breadth of the claims is excessive with regard to Applicants' claiming all SNPs at the locations in SEQ ID NO:17 and 18. Applicants have only taught that 3 SNPs and 3 amino acid changes occur. Applicants have provided no guidance or working examples of not only what the function is of these 3 SNPs/amino acid changes, but have also not provided any guidance or working examples of what the function is of any other SNP. Furthermore, it is not predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art as to what bases or amino acids can occur in SEQ ID NO:17 or 18 to produce a functional protein.

8. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

A. Claims 61 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: other elements of the kit besides a polynucleotide in a vector and a carrier. It is not clear for what reason the kit is to be used.

9. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

A. Claims 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 56, 58, 60 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Encinas et al. (WO 02/53,733). The claims recite a polynucleotide if SEQ ID NO:17 or encoding SEQ ID NO:18 in which there is an isoleucine at residue 128. Encinas et al. teach this protein (Sequence Comparison) as well as vectors, host cells and kits (at least claims 1, 2, 7 and 8).

10. Conclusion

A. No claim is allowable.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Landsman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern time) and alternate Fridays from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (703) 308-4623.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242. Fax draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Robert Landsman, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Group 1600
November 07, 2003

ROBERT LANDSMAN
PATENT EXAMINER